

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this Application and the Office Action of April 7, 2005 are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Original claims 1 to 59 remain under consideration in this application.

It is noted with appreciation that Examiner Chu has indicated Claims 1 to 11 are allowed.

It is further noted with appreciation that Examiner Chu has indicated that claims 21, 24, 27, 28, 34, 35, 41, 45-48, 52, 53 and 56-59 are drawn to allowable subject matter, but are objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, and would be allowed if written in independent form including all the limitation of the base and any intervening claims. It is respectfully submitted that the base claim is allowable for at least the reasons set forth hereafter and it is therefore unnecessary to write these claims in independent form.

Additionally, Applicant notes the following. Claims 1 to 11 have been allowed because of the novelty and unobviousness of the polybenzoxazole precursor polymers of Structure (I) to which these claims are directed—as stated in paragraph 6 of the Office Action. Thus, any resin composition claims of resin composition claims 12-37, any process claims of process claims 38-48, and any substrate claims of substrate claims 49-59, that require the presence of the novel and unobvious polybenzoxazole precursor polymer of structure (1) would also be novel, unobvious and therefore patentable. In part, due to the

readily apparent correctness of this previous sentence, Examiner Chu has indicated that claims 21, 24, 27, 28, 34, 35, 41, 45-48, 52, 53 and 56-59 are drawn to allowable subject matter. However, such listing of allowable claims is incomplete. Claims 23, 26, 29, 30, 37, 42, 43 and 54 all require the presence of the polybenzoxazole precursor polymer of Structure (I) and therefore should also have been indicated to be allowable. Thus, insofar as the prior art rejections of paragraphs 2 and 4 of the April 7, 2005 Office Action have been applied to these claims 23, 26, 29, 30, 37, 42, 43 and 54, those rejections are erroneous and Applicant respectfully requests the PTO to reconsider and withdraw those rejections insofar as they are applied to claims 23, 26, 29, 30, 37, 42, 43 and 54.

The rejection of claims 12-20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29-32, 38-40, 43, 44 and 49-51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,376,151 B1 to Takahashi et al. or US Patent No. 5,376,499 to Hammerschmidt et al. is respectfully traversed. In Applicant's claim 12, at the end of section (b) defining the non-polymeric photosensitive compounds, there is recited the following provisos: "with the provisos: (1) that for Structure IV, if $a = b = 1$ and both OQ are substituted para to the R^1R^2C substituent, then both R^1 and R^2 are not simultaneously methyl, and (2) $1 \leq a+b < 6$; and the proviso that for Structure VI, if $a = b = c = 1$ and all OQ are para to the triphenyl methane carbon substituent, then at least one R^3 is not H". When these provisos of claim 12 are taken into consideration and given effect, the photosensitive compounds of the Takahashi et al. and Hammerschmidt et al. patents are not within the scope of any of Applicant's claims 12-20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29-32, 38-40, 43, 44 and 49-51 and the lack of novelty rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over these two patents is erroneous. Therefore, the PTO is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 12-20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29-32, 38-40, 43, 44 and 49-51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the Takahashi et al. and Hammerschmidt et al. patents.

The rejection of claims 12-20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29-33, 38-40, 43, 44 and 49-51 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the Takahashi et al. or Hammerschmidt et al.

patents in view of US Patent No. 6,071,666 to Hirano et al. is also respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that the disclosures in these documents do not render the claimed invention obvious to one skilled in the relevant art.

As stated above, the disclosures in Takahashi et al. and Hammerschmidt et al. do not disclose compositions with the non-polymeric photosensitive compounds required by section (b) of claim 12 and this alone is sufficient to render this rejection erroneous. Moreover, the teachings in those two patents do not teach one skilled in the art to employ the non-polymeric photosensitive compounds of section (b) of claim 12 in order to obtain the improvement in the light color obtained after cure with DNQ photoactive compounds not having benzylic hydrogens as disclosed in the present application—see paragraph [0040]. Thus, for this additional reason the Section 103 rejection is erroneously based and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, as the Office Action states, each of these two patents “lacks a specific disclosure for the specific silane adhesion promoting agent disclosed in claims 32-33.” In view of this deficiency in the primary patents’ disclosures the PTO relies upon the disclosure in Hirano et al. as disclosing organosilane compounds and contends that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to add an organosilane agent as taught by Hirano et al. as an adhesion promoter and reasonably expect same or similar results as disclosed in Takahashi et al. and Hammerschmidt et al. However, the organosilane adhesion promoters of Hirano et al. are not within the scope of the adhesion promoters of Applicant’s claims 32 and 33. Moreover, the organosilane adhesion promoters of Hirano et al. are ones that are disclosed that must be used with polyamides of Hirano et al.’s formula (1) and with compositions containing the phenols of Hirano et al.’s formulae (2) and (3). Applicant’s compositions do not require or employ the phenols of Hirano et al.’s formulae (2) and (3), nor the polyamides of Hirano et al.’s formula (1). There is nothing in Hirano et al. to teach one skilled in the art to employ the different silane compounds of applicant’s claims, nor for that

matter to employ the different adhesion promoters of Hirano et al. in the different polybenzoxazole precursor polymer compositions of Takahashi et al. or Hammerschmidt et al. Additionally there is nothing in Hirano et al. to cure the deficiency in either of the primary reference to teach one skilled in the art to employ the non-polymeric photosensitive compounds of section (b) of claim 12 in order to obtain the improvement in the light color obtained after cure with DNQ photoactive compounds not having benzylic hydrogens. Thus, the Section 103 rejection of the claims is clearly erroneous and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing is a full and complete response to the Office Action and that the claims are allowable. An early indication of their allowability by issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 10, 2005



Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Registration No. 31.019
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401